

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD**

STEPHANIE S. REEDER,
Appellant,

DOCKET NUMBER
DE-0752-20-0346-I-1

v.

SOCIAL SECURITY
ADMINISTRATION,
Agency.

DATE: January 24, 2023

THIS FINAL ORDER IS NONPRECEDENTIAL¹

Jeffrey H. Jacobson, Esquire, Tucson, Arizona, for the appellant.

Ann L. Maley, Esquire, San Francisco, California, for the agency.

BEFORE

Cathy A. Harris, Vice Chairman
Raymond A. Limon, Member
Tristan L. Leavitt, Member
Member Leavitt dissents without an opinion.

FINAL ORDER

¶1 The agency has filed a petition for review of the initial decision, which reversed the appellant's reduction in grade and pay. Generally, we grant petitions such as this one only in the following circumstances: the initial decision contains

¹ A nonprecedential order is one that the Board has determined does not add significantly to the body of MSPB case law. Parties may cite nonprecedential orders, but such orders have no precedential value; the Board and administrative judges are not required to follow or distinguish them in any future decisions. In contrast, a precedential decision issued as an Opinion and Order has been identified by the Board as significantly contributing to the Board's case law. See [5 C.F.R. § 1201.117\(c\)](#).

erroneous findings of material fact; the initial decision is based on an erroneous interpretation of statute or regulation or the erroneous application of the law to the facts of the case; the administrative judge's rulings during either the course of the appeal or the initial decision were not consistent with required procedures or involved an abuse of discretion, and the resulting error affected the outcome of the case; or new and material evidence or legal argument is available that, despite the petitioner's due diligence, was not available when the record closed. Title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations, section 1201.115 ([5 C.F.R. § 1201.115](#)). After fully considering the filings in this appeal, we conclude that the petitioner has not established any basis under section 1201.115 for granting the petition for review. Therefore, we DENY the petition for review and AFFIRM the initial decision, which is now the Board's final decision. [5 C.F.R. § 1201.113\(b\)](#).

¶2 On review, the agency argues that the administrative judge did not apply the correct legal standard in finding that the appellant did not violate [5 C.F.R. § 2635.101\(b\)\(14\)](#), as alleged in specifications 1 and 2 of the conduct unbecoming charge.² Section 2625.101(b)(14) provides that employees "shall endeavor to avoid any actions creating the appearance that they are violating . . . ethical standards." The substantive ethical standard at issue here is in turn found at [5 C.F.R. § 2625.101\(b\)\(8\)](#), which provides that employees "shall act impartially and not give preferential treatment to any private organization or individual." As the agency notes, section 2635.101(b)(14) further provides that "[w]hether particular circumstances create an appearance that ethical standards have been violated shall be determined from the perspective of a reasonable person with

² We discern no error in the administrative judge's construal of these specifications. See *Boltz v. Social Security Administration*, [111 M.S.P.R. 568](#), ¶ 16 (2009) (in resolving how a charge should be construed and what elements require proof, the Board examines the structure and language of the proposal notice and decision letter). We find that it was unnecessary for the administrative judge to also determine whether the appellant complied with the separate requirements of [5 C.F.R. § 2635.502](#), and we do not address the agency's challenge to the administrative judge's findings on that issue.

knowledge of the relevant facts.” The Board has also explained that fundamental fairness precludes disciplining an employee for creating the appearance of an ethical violation unless she should have known it would appear improper to a reasonable observer under the circumstances. *Ryan v. Department of Homeland Security*, [123 M.S.P.R. 202](#), ¶ 13 (2016). Hence, as the agency states, it is appropriate to apply a “reasonable person” standard in determining whether the appellant violated section 2635.101(b)(14) by creating the appearance that she was not impartial when she hired R.N.

¶3 The agency contends that a reasonable person with knowledge of the relevant facts would find that the appellant’s involvement in the hiring of her son’s girlfriend created the appearance of lack of impartiality. In support of its assertion, the agency lists a number of facts that were available to the appellant. Petition for Review File, Tab 1 at 9. However, that list conspicuously omits the crucial fact that the appellant’s first-level supervisor, R.C., had specifically advised her that her participation in the hiring process for R.N. did not raise any ethical concerns. Considering that the appellant had been so advised, we are not persuaded that she knew or should have known that hiring R.N. for either position would appear improper to a reasonable observer. Hence, we find that fundamental fairness precludes disciplining the appellant for creating the appearance of an ethical violation.

¶4 The agency also contends that the administrative judge erred in crediting the appellant’s testimony that she had timely provided R.C. adequate information concerning her son’s current romantic relationship with R.N. and her own friendship with R.N.’s mother. However, we find the agency has not identified sufficiently sound reasons for overturning the administrative judge’s credibility determination, which was implicitly based on his observations of witness demeanor. See *Purifoy v. Department of Veterans Affairs*, [838 F.3d 1367](#), 1372-73 (Fed. Cir. 2016); *Haebe v. Department of Justice*, [288 F.3d 1288](#), 1301 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

¶5 The agency also argues that the administrative judge should have granted its request to call a rebuttal witness, M.P., who, according to the agency, would have testified that the appellant had told M.P. that, during the appellant’s previous conversation with R.C., the appellant had indicated to R.C. that R.N. was a “friend.” Hearing Transcript at 143 (Dec. 16, 2020). We discern no abuse of discretion in the administrative judge’s decision to deny the agency’s request, considering that the proffered hearsay testimony was already available in the written record, Initial Appeal File, Tab 11 at 27-34, the agency had failed to request M.P. as a witness before the hearing, and the appellant had testified consistently to her own recollection of the conversation. *See Franco v. U.S. Postal Service*, [27 M.S.P.R. 322](#), 325 (1985) (holding that an administrative judge has wide discretion under the Board’s regulations to exclude witnesses when it has not been shown that their testimony would be relevant, material, and nonrepetitious); *see also* [5 C.F.R. § 1201.41](#)(b)(8), (10).

¶6 To the extent the agency otherwise disagrees with the administrative judge’s weighing of the evidence, the agency’s mere disagreement with his findings provides no basis for further review. *See Crosby v. U.S. Postal Service*, [74 M.S.P.R. 98](#), 106 (1997) (finding no reason to disturb the administrative judge’s findings when she considered the evidence as a whole, drew appropriate inferences, and made reasoned conclusions); *Broughton v. Department of Health & Human Services*, [33 M.S.P.R. 357](#), 359 (1987) (same). Accordingly, we deny the agency’s petition.

ORDER

¶7 We ORDER the agency to cancel the appellant’s reduction in grade and pay and to restore the appellant effective July 5, 2020. *See Kerr v. National Endowment for the Arts*, [726 F.2d 730](#) (Fed. Cir. 1984). The agency must complete this action no later than 20 days after the date of this decision.

- ¶8 We also ORDER the agency to pay the appellant the correct amount of back pay, interest on back pay, and other benefits under the Office of Personnel Management's regulations, no later than 60 calendar days after the date of this decision. We ORDER the appellant to cooperate in good faith in the agency's efforts to calculate the amount of back pay, interest, and benefits due, and to provide all necessary information the agency requests to help it carry out the Board's Order. If there is a dispute about the amount of back pay, interest due, and/or other benefits, we ORDER the agency to pay the appellant the undisputed amount no later than 60 calendar days after the date of this decision.
- ¶9 We further ORDER the agency to tell the appellant promptly in writing when it believes it has fully carried out the Board's Order and of the actions it has taken to carry out the Board's Order. The appellant, if not notified, should ask the agency about its progress. *See* [5 C.F.R. § 1201.181\(b\)](#).
- ¶10 No later than 30 days after the agency tells the appellant that it has fully carried out the Board's Order, the appellant may file a petition for enforcement with the office that issued the initial decision on this appeal if the appellant believes that the agency did not fully carry out the Board's Order. The petition should contain specific reasons why the appellant believes that the agency has not fully carried out the Board's Order, and should include the dates and results of any communications with the agency. [5 C.F.R. § 1201.182\(a\)](#).
- ¶11 For agencies whose payroll is administered by either the National Finance Center of the Department of Agriculture (NFC) or the Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS), two lists of the information and documentation necessary to process payments and adjustments resulting from a Board decision are attached. The agency is ORDERED to timely provide DFAS or NFC with all documentation necessary to process payments and adjustments resulting from the Board's decision in accordance with the attached lists so that payment can be made within the 60-day period set forth above.

**NOTICE TO THE APPELLANT REGARDING
YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST
ATTORNEY FEES AND COSTS**

You may be entitled to be paid by the agency for your reasonable attorney fees and costs. To be paid, you must meet the requirements set forth at Title 5 of the United States Code (5 U.S.C.), sections 7701(g), 1221(g), or 1214(g). The regulations may be found at [5 C.F.R. §§ 1201.201](#), 1201.202, and 1201.203. If you believe you meet these requirements, you must file a motion for attorney fees and costs **WITHIN 60 CALENDAR DAYS OF THE DATE OF THIS DECISION**. You must file your motion for attorney fees and costs with the office that issued the initial decision on your appeal.

NOTICE OF APPEAL RIGHTS³

You may obtain review of this final decision. [5 U.S.C. § 7703](#)(a)(1). By statute, the nature of your claims determines the time limit for seeking such review and the appropriate forum with which to file. [5 U.S.C. § 7703](#)(b). Although we offer the following summary of available appeal rights, the Merit Systems Protection Board does not provide legal advice on which option is most appropriate for your situation and the rights described below do not represent a statement of how courts will rule regarding which cases fall within their jurisdiction. If you wish to seek review of this final decision, you should immediately review the law applicable to your claims and carefully follow all filing time limits and requirements. Failure to file within the applicable time limit may result in the dismissal of your case by your chosen forum.

Please read carefully each of the three main possible choices of review below to decide which one applies to your particular case. If you have questions

³ Since the issuance of the initial decision in this matter, the Board may have updated the notice of review rights included in final decisions. As indicated in the notice, the Board cannot advise which option is most appropriate in any matter.

about whether a particular forum is the appropriate one to review your case, you should contact that forum for more information.

(1) Judicial review in general. As a general rule, an appellant seeking judicial review of a final Board order must file a petition for review with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, which must be received by the court within **60 calendar days** of the date of issuance of this decision. [5 U.S.C. § 7703\(b\)\(1\)\(A\).](#)

If you submit a petition for review to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, you must submit your petition to the court at the following address:

U.S. Court of Appeals
for the Federal Circuit
717 Madison Place, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20439

Additional information about the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit is available at the court's website, www.cafc.uscourts.gov. Of particular relevance is the court's "Guide for Pro Se Petitioners and Appellants," which is contained within the court's Rules of Practice, and Forms 5, 6, 10, and 11.

If you are interested in securing pro bono representation for an appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, you may visit our website at <http://www.mspb.gov/probono> for information regarding pro bono representation for Merit Systems Protection Board appellants before the Federal Circuit. The Board neither endorses the services provided by any attorney nor warrants that any attorney will accept representation in a given case.

(2) Judicial or EEOC review of cases involving a claim of discrimination. This option applies to you only if you have claimed that you were affected by an action that is appealable to the Board and that such action was based, in whole or in part, on unlawful discrimination. If so, you may obtain

judicial review of this decision—including a disposition of your discrimination claims—by filing a civil action with an appropriate U.S. district court (*not* the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit), within **30 calendar days** after you receive this decision. [5 U.S.C. § 7703\(b\)\(2\)](#); *see Perry v. Merit Systems Protection Board*, 582 U.S. ____ , [137 S. Ct. 1975](#) (2017). If you have a representative in this case, and your representative receives this decision before you do, then you must file with the district court no later than **30 calendar days** after your representative receives this decision. If the action involves a claim of discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, or a disabling condition, you may be entitled to representation by a court-appointed lawyer and to waiver of any requirement of prepayment of fees, costs, or other security. *See* [42 U.S.C. § 2000e-5\(f\)](#) and [29 U.S.C. § 794a](#).

Contact information for U.S. district courts can be found at their respective websites, which can be accessed through the link below:

http://www.uscourts.gov/Court_Locator/CourtWebsites.aspx.

Alternatively, you may request review by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) of your discrimination claims only, excluding all other issues. [5 U.S.C. § 7702\(b\)\(1\)](#). You must file any such request with the EEOC's Office of Federal Operations within **30 calendar days** after you receive this decision. [5 U.S.C. § 7702\(b\)\(1\)](#). If you have a representative in this case, and your representative receives this decision before you do, then you must file with the EEOC no later than **30 calendar days** after your representative receives this decision.

If you submit a request for review to the EEOC by regular U.S. mail, the address of the EEOC is:

Office of Federal Operations
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
P.O. Box 77960
Washington, D.C. 20013

If you submit a request for review to the EEOC via commercial delivery or by a method requiring a signature, it must be addressed to:

Office of Federal Operations
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
131 M Street, N.E.
Suite 5SW12G
Washington, D.C. 20507

(3) Judicial review pursuant to the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2012. This option applies to you only if you have raised claims of reprisal for whistleblowing disclosures under [5 U.S.C. § 2302](#)(b)(8) or other protected activities listed in [5 U.S.C. § 2302](#)(b)(9)(A)(i), (B), (C), or (D). If so, and your judicial petition for review “raises no challenge to the Board’s disposition of allegations of a prohibited personnel practice described in section 2302(b) other than practices described in section 2302(b)(8), or 2302(b)(9)(A)(i), (B), (C), or (D),” then you may file a petition for judicial review either with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit or any court of appeals of competent jurisdiction.⁴ The court of appeals must receive your petition for review within **60 days** of the date of issuance of this decision. [5 U.S.C. § 7703](#)(b)(1)(B).

If you submit a petition for judicial review to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, you must submit your petition to the court at the following address:

U.S. Court of Appeals
for the Federal Circuit

⁴ The original statutory provision that provided for judicial review of certain whistleblower claims by any court of appeals of competent jurisdiction expired on December 27, 2017. The All Circuit Review Act, signed into law by the President on July 7, 2018, permanently allows appellants to file petitions for judicial review of MSPB decisions in certain whistleblower reprisal cases with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit or any other circuit court of appeals of competent jurisdiction. The All Circuit Review Act is retroactive to November 26, 2017. Pub. L. No. 115-195, 132 Stat. 1510.

717 Madison Place, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20439

Additional information about the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit is available at the court's website, www.cafc.uscourts.gov. Of particular relevance is the court's "Guide for Pro Se Petitioners and Appellants," which is contained within the court's Rules of Practice, and Forms 5, 6, 10, and 11.

If you are interested in securing pro bono representation for an appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, you may visit our website at <http://www.mspb.gov/probono> for information regarding pro bono representation for Merit Systems Protection Board appellants before the Federal Circuit. The Board neither endorses the services provided by any attorney nor warrants that any attorney will accept representation in a given case.

Contact information for the courts of appeals can be found at their respective websites, which can be accessed through the link below:

http://www.uscourts.gov/Court_Locator/CourtWebsites.aspx.

FOR THE BOARD:

Washington, D.C.

/s/ for

Jennifer Everling
Acting Clerk of the Board



DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE Civilian Pay Operations

DFAS BACK PAY CHECKLIST

The following documentation is required by DFAS Civilian Pay to compute and pay back pay pursuant to 5 CFR § 550.805. Human resources/local payroll offices should use the following checklist to ensure a request for payment of back pay is complete. Missing documentation may substantially delay the processing of a back pay award. **More information may be found at: <https://wss.apan.org/public/DFASPayroll/Back%20Pay%20Process/Forms/AllItems.aspx>.**

NOTE: Attorneys' fees or other non-wage payments (such as damages) are paid by vendor pay, not DFAS Civilian Pay.

- ☐ 1) Submit a **"SETTLEMENT INQUIRY - Submission"** Remedy Ticket. Please identify the specific dates of the back pay period within the ticket comments.

Attach the following documentation to the Remedy Ticket, or provide a statement in the ticket comments as to why the documentation is not applicable:

- ☐ 2) Settlement agreement, administrative determination, arbitrator award, or order.
- ☐ 3) Signed and completed "Employee Statement Relative to Back Pay".
- ☐ 4) All required SF50s (new, corrected, or canceled). *****Do not process online SF50s until notified to do so by DFAS Civilian Pay.*****
- ☐ 5) Certified timecards/corrected timecards. *****Do not process online timecards until notified to do so by DFAS Civilian Pay.*****
- ☐ 6) All relevant benefit election forms (e.g. TSP, FEHB, etc.).
- ☐ 7) Outside earnings documentation. Include record of all amounts earned by the employee in a job undertaken during the back pay period to replace federal employment. Documentation includes W-2 or 1099 statements, payroll documents/records, etc. Also, include record of any unemployment earning statements, workers' compensation, CSRS/FERS retirement annuity payments, refunds of CSRS/FERS employee premiums, or severance pay received by the employee upon separation.

Lump Sum Leave Payment Debts: When a separation is later reversed, there is no authority under [5 U.S.C. § 5551](#) for the reinstated employee to keep the lump sum annual leave payment they may have received. The payroll office must collect the debt from the back pay award. The annual leave will be restored to the employee. Annual leave that exceeds the annual leave ceiling will be restored to a separate leave account pursuant to 5 CFR § 550.805(g).



NATIONAL FINANCE CENTER CHECKLIST FOR BACK PAY CASES

Below is the information/documentation required by National Finance Center to process payments/adjustments agreed on in Back Pay Cases (settlements, restorations) or as ordered by the Merit Systems Protection Board, EEOC, and courts.

1. Initiate and submit AD-343 (Payroll/Action Request) with clear and concise information describing what to do in accordance with decision.
2. The following information must be included on AD-343 for Restoration:
 - a. Employee name and social security number.
 - b. Detailed explanation of request.
 - c. Valid agency accounting.
 - d. Authorized signature (Table 63).
 - e. If interest is to be included.
 - f. Check mailing address.
 - g. Indicate if case is prior to conversion. Computations must be attached.
 - h. Indicate the amount of Severance and Lump Sum Annual Leave Payment to be collected (if applicable).

Attachments to AD-343

1. Provide pay entitlement to include Overtime, Night Differential, Shift Premium, Sunday Premium, etc. with number of hours and dates for each entitlement (if applicable).
2. Copies of SF-50s (Personnel Actions) or list of salary adjustments/changes and amounts.
3. Outside earnings documentation statement from agency.
4. If employee received retirement annuity or unemployment, provide amount and address to return monies.
5. Provide forms for FEGLI, FEHBA, or TSP deductions. (if applicable)
6. If employee was unable to work during any or part of the period involved, certification of the type of leave to be charged and number of hours.
7. If employee retires at end of Restoration Period, provide hours of Lump Sum Annual Leave to be paid.

NOTE: If prior to conversion, agency must attach Computation Worksheet by Pay Period and required data in 1-7 above.

The following information must be included on AD-343 for Settlement Cases: (Lump Sum Payment, Correction to Promotion, Wage Grade Increase, FLSA, etc.)

- a. Must provide same data as in 2, a-g above.
- b. Prior to conversion computation must be provided.
- c. Lump Sum amount of Settlement, and if taxable or non-taxable.

If you have any questions or require clarification on the above, please contact NFC's Payroll/Personnel Operations at 504-255-4630.